Editorial

Editorial – RRR 22.1

While diverse in topic, geography and chronology the articles in this issue speak variously to the theme of humanist and scholastic influences on the Reformations of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. An important theme running through all the articles is that of freedom, whether understood in terms of the broader narrative of salvation history or the nitty-gritty reality of theological polemic and political debate. The weight of the past, and especially the patristic and medieval inheritance, is also a common thread and particularly the way that diverse figures, ranging from sixteenth-century German Anabaptists to seventeenth-century Reformed champions of orthodoxy, wrestled with this and sought to shape and reshape it according to their varying biblical, philosophical and theological priorities and then to express it anew according to the idiom of Reformation and restitution.

In this light, Andrew Klager's article offers a new perspective on Balthasar Hubmaier, the celebrated Anabaptist theologian and martyr. While many scholars have posited an important connection between Anabaptism and a broad Erasmian humanism, Klager seeks to add precision to this thesis by being the first to examine in detail Hubmaier's specific humanist influences. Building on Lewis Spitz and James Overfield's influential accounts of the rise of German humanism, and taking up a nuanced version of Paul Kristeller's thesis of humanism and scholasticism as competing methodologies, he deftly traces the reception of humanist thought within the German universities of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. Given his subject, Klager's focus is naturally on the two German universities of Freiburg im Breisgau and Ingolstadt, where Hubmaier attained his baccalaureate and his doctorate in theology respectively. Importantly, as mid-fifteenth century foundations, both belonged to the "second wave" of medieval German universities and so proved more receptive to humanist influence. Klager highlights the influence on Hubmaier of noted German humanists such as Ulrich Zasius, Jakob Wimpfeling and above-all Johann Eck, the famous opponent of Luther. In particular, he shows how Hubmaier proved receptive to both Eck's biblical humanism and his conciliatory approach of reconciling divergent approaches, including not least scholasticism and humanism themselves. He also points tantalisingly towards the possibility of a humanist and Eckian influence on Hubmaier's pioneering views on free will and religious tolerance – a fruitful topic for further research, which promises to open up new perspectives on the Radical Reformation movement and its genesis.

Steven Foster's article explores the topic of political theology in the English, and specifically Edwardian, Reformation, taking as its *locus classicus* the Apostle Paul's teaching on obedience in Romans 13. The paramount importance of this biblical text in the Reformation debates is well known, and Foster shows how important scholars such as Quentin Skinner and Diarmaid MacCulloch have already parsed this as, in political terms at least, *the* defining text of the magisterial Reformation. It is therefore significant that Foster should seek to open up new avenues in its interpretation, demonstrating how it could be used in the highly-charged context of the rebellions of 1549 not only to buttress obedience to magistrates – the standard interpretation – but also to implicate political and ecclesiastical elites within a narrative of national sinfulness. Drawing on texts and sermons by Archbishop Thomas Cranmer, Bishop Hugh Latimer and other important figures such as Robert Crowley and Thomas Lever, Foster traces the outlines of a thinly-veiled critique of Protector Somerset's avaricious regime and its failure to establish a "godly commonweal". At the same time, within the established framework of a Henrician and Tyndalian theology of royal supremacy, we also find articulated a growing understanding of the reciprocal rights of subjects and rulers, which Foster argues reflects an increasing appropriation of international Reformed currents of political theology. Given their polarising character, the 1549 rebellions have long been seen as a barometer of Edwardian public opinion. Building on the work of Torrance Kirby and others, Foster has demonstrated once again their important role in gauging the seismic shifts taking place in the English Church and society of the mid-sixteenth century.

Nicholas Cumming's article offers an important contextualisation of Francis Turretin's doctrine of sin, focusing specifically on the vexed question of how sin can be a punishment for sin. The wider context

for this article is the ongoing debate, recently reopened by advocates of union with Christ as a new "central dogma", over continuity and discontinuity within the early modern Reformed tradition. Drawing on Richard Muller's influential argument for significant continuity between medieval scholasticism, Calvin and the later Reformed tradition, Cumming uses Turretin's hamartiology as an important test case. Turretin is undoubtedly a key figure in this regard as the "standard bearer of high orthodoxy" in Geneva and an influential opponent of the Amyraldian theology of universal redemption, which he and others saw as just as dangerous as Arminianism – indeed, perhaps even more dangerous, due to its emergence from within the ranks of the Reformed orthodox themselves. Cumming shows how Turretin directed his account against Josué de la Place's Amyraldian view that Adam's descendants only inherited a propensity to sin and did not have imputed to them Adam's actual sin and guilt. He then skilfully draws out Turretin's sources, preeminently in Scripture itself but also in Augustine and medieval and early modern scholasticism. While Cumming privileges the Augustinian-Thomist axis, he also pays due attention to the influence of unexpected figures like the fifteenth-century German Nominalist Gabriel Biel and the Jesuit Martin Becanus. Overall, we gain a sensitive and nuanced picture of Turretin as a theologian indisputably in the line of Calvin, but also seeking to draw his synthesis from a much broader Christian tradition, and above all to marshal it against the new Pelagian threat represented by Amyraldianism and nascent Enlightenment thought.

Takayuki Yagi's article offers a fresh look at voluntarism in William Ames, a seminal figure in both early modern Reformed theology and the seventeenth-century English Puritan movement. Previous scholarly reflection, especially in John Eusden, Norman Fiering and Lynne Boughton, has highlighted a definite voluntarist impulse in Ames but struggled to harmonise this with his account of the will as a rational appetite. The result, according to Yagi, has been an unbalanced view of Ames as a radical or extreme voluntarist. By placing Ames' account of the will firmly within a scholastic paradigm, he offers a detailed and perceptive discussion of his debt to both Aquinas and Scotus. Although there has long been a tendency to view Thomist and Scotist accounts of free will as utterly irreconcilable, he demonstrates well the way that Ames was able to integrate aspects of both into a subtle view of the dynamics of intellect and will under the operation of grace. Focusing on the role of intellect and will in the act of faith, Yagi views them as "mutual and complementary, and not contradictory or exclusive". His fundamental thesis is that Ames successfully combines a Scotist view of the will as a self-determining power with an intrinsic freedom towards opposites with a Thomist understanding of grace as divine "premotion". In light of recent debates between Richard Muller, Paul Helm, Antonie Vos and others, such a thesis potentially has much broader implications for the study of Reformed orthodoxy and its medieval inheritance.

As the new, incoming editor I would like to thank the outgoing editor Professor Ian Hazlett for his many years of dedicated service as editor of *Reformation and Renaissance Review*, during which time the journal has clearly gone from strength to strength. I hope very much to be able to continue his legacy. I would also like to thank him for all his help and advice during the transition period and especially for his great assistance in the effective co-editing of this my first issue. Grateful thanks are also due to the Society of Reformation Studies for all their continued support, to the entire editorial team and especially to Dr Jon Balserak, the book reviews editor, and finally to Rajesh and all the production team at Taylor and Francis for their excellent work in preparing and copy-editing the journal.